

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated May 16, 2008, and is believed to be fully responsive to each point of the rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 14, 16, 22, and 27 are independent. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11-14, 16-18, 22, and 27 are amended. Claim 20 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives by Examiner of Record Christopher Gray and Supervisory Patent Examiner Aung Moe at the interview held on July 2, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

On page 2, the Office Action objects to claims 1 and 12-27 for not defining acronyms within the claims. In response, Applicant hereby amends the claims to fully define the first instance of each acronym. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 and 12-27.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In sections 1-2 on pages 2-5, the Office Action rejects claims 22-24, 26, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0031059 to Bialk et al. (hereinafter "Bialk"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As amended, independent claim 22 recites "means for verifying validity of a user request with respect to each EMS against a set of rules and limitations before sending the user request to each EMS." Independent claim 27 contains a similar recitation. Support for this added subject matter may be found in the specification, for example, in paragraph [0053].

Applicant respectfully submits that Bialk fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the above-quoted subject matter. As agreed at the interview on July 2, 2008, and memorialized in the Interview Summary, Bialk fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "means for verifying validity of a user request with respect to each EMS against a set of rules and limitations before sending the user request to each EMS," as recited in claim 22 and similarly recited in claim 27. Thus, claims 22 and 27 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23, 24, and 26 are allowable based at least on their dependence from claim 22 for the reasons stated above in connection with claim 22. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 22-24 and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In sections 3-4 on pages 5-16, the Office Action rejects claims 1-21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bialk in view of Published U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0133556 to Naik et al. (hereinafter "Naik"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 1 and 14 recite "verifying validity of said user request with respect to each EMS against a set of rules and limitations." Independent claim 16 recites "means for verifying validity of said user request relative to each EMS against a set of rules and limitations." Applicant respectfully submits that Bialk fails to disclose, teach, or suggest this subject matter, as discussed further above in connection with the rejection of claims 22 and 27, which include similar recitations. Naik fails to overcome this deficiency in Bialk. Thus, independent claims 1, 14, and 16 are allowable.

Claim 2-13 depend from allowable claim 1, claim 15 depends from allowable claim 14, claims 17-19 and 21 depend from allowable claim 16, and claim 25 depends from allowable claim 22. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-13, 15, 17-19, and 21, and 25 are allowable based at least on their dependence from allowable claims. Claim 20 has been canceled. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.


CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

While we believe that the instant request places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the correspondence attorney listed below at the telephone number listed below in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.



Terry W. Kramer
Registration No.: 41,541

Date: July 7, 2008

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802